

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

RICHARD GLOSSIP, et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
-vs-)	Case No. CIV-14-0665-F
)	
RANDY CHANDLER, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Plaintiff Wade Lay, who appears *pro se* and whose pleadings are liberally construed, has filed two motions. Doc. nos. 403, 404. No response has yet been filed, but no response is necessary for the court to rule.


Doc. no. 403 asks the court to enter a protective order. The motion complains about matters inside the prison such as the availability of legal services, the handling of legal mail, showers, hot water, a hot pot, and the phone (including a complaint that the way in which the phone is handled contributes to the spread of COVID-19). Mr. Lay argues a protective order is necessary with respect to these matters so that he can prepare for trial. The issues raised in the motion are outside the claims alleged in this action.

Doc. no. 404 asks the court to reconsider its order of March 31, 2021, which denied Mr. Lay's motion for discovery under Rule 56(d), Fed. R. Civ. P., and denied Mr. Lay's request for an extension of time within which to respond to defendants' motion for summary judgment. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not recognize a motion to reconsider. Nevertheless, the court has considered Mr. Lay's

motion to reconsider. Having done so, the court finds no basis for reconsideration of the March 31 order.

For the reasons stated, the motions are **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 13th day of April, 2021.


STEPHEN P. FRIOT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14-0665p095.docx